

## **TECHNICAL REPORT**

---

**May 2004**

# **Evaluation of MAP (Mini-Grant Alcohol Program) Projects in Illinois in 2003**

Compiled and Prepared by

Illinois Department of Transportation  
Division of Traffic Safety  
Evaluation Unit  
3215 Executive Park Drive  
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9245

# **Illinois Department of Transportation**

## **Division of Traffic Safety**

### **Evaluation Unit**

The Evaluation Unit within the Division of Traffic Safety in the Illinois Department of Transportation focuses on evaluation and monitoring of various highway safety programs in Illinois. The research and evaluation issues include costs and benefits of child seats, safety belts and motorcycle helmets in the real world of crashes, evaluation of highway safety projects and programs, such as Traffic Law Enforcement Program (TLEP), Local Alcohol Program (LAP), IMaGE projects, high accident locations project, and health care costs and utilization of motor vehicle crash victims.

During FY03, the Division of Traffic Safety funded 21 MAP projects. A MAP grantee is usually a local police agency with an adequate number of police officers who are familiar with traffic safety related issues. The main goal of the MAP program is to reduce the number of individuals involved in fatal and serious injury impaired driving crashes by focusing on impaired driving violations at selected locations and selected time slots. The enforcement activities were scheduled seven times a year (two-week period per campaign).

The report was compiled and prepared by the Evaluation staff. Comments or questions may be addressed to Mehdi Nassirpour, Chief of Evaluation Unit, Bureau of Administrative Services, Division of Traffic Safety, Illinois Department of Transportation, 3215 Executive Park Drive, Springfield, Illinois 62794-9245.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary of MAP Program.....	1
Evaluation of MAP Program.....	4
Category 1: Population 2,501-10,000 .....	7
Category 2: Population 10,001-25,000 .....	10
Category 3: Population 25,001-50,000 .....	13
Category 4: Population 50,001 and over.....	16
Trend Analysis of Selected MAP Projects (2001-2003) .....	18
Appendix A .....	28
Appendix B .....	29

## List of Tables

Table 1: Data Summary Table .....	3
Table A: Selected Objectives by Selected Population Categories .....	6
Table 2: Population 2,501-10,000 .....	9
Table 3: Population 10,001-25,000 .....	12
Table 4: Population 25,001-50,000 .....	15
Table 5: Population 50,001 and over .....	17
Table 6: Project Trend Analysis 2001 to 2003 .....	27

## **Executive Summary of MAP Program**

During FY03, the Division of Traffic Safety funded 21 MAP projects. A MAP grantee is usually a local police agency with an adequate number of police officers who are familiar with traffic safety related issues. The main goal of the MAP program is to reduce the number of individuals involved in fatal and serious injury impaired driving crashes by focussing on impaired driving violations at selected locations and selected time slots. The enforcement activities were scheduled seven times a year (two-week period per campaign).

Summary data and information on these 21 projects are provided in **Table 1**. **Table 1** shows total traffic enforcement data for the seven enforcement campaigns. In addition, summary statistics, such as average campaign patrol hours, motorist contact rate, percent occupant protection violations, percent speed violations, DUI rate and alcohol-related contact rate are reported in this table.

Based on the data provided by the MAP grantees, the following results were obtained:

1. Selected police departments had a total of 5,082 patrol hours, an average of 726 hours per campaign (5,082 divided by 7 campaigns).
2. A total of 6,088 vehicles were stopped during these campaigns, with a vehicle contact rate of one for every 50.1 minutes of patrol.
3. A total of 5,455 citations and written warnings were issued (one for every 55.9 minutes).
4. There were 1,513 speeding citations issued during the seven enforcement campaigns.
5. A total of 502 DUI citations were issued.
6. There were 526 alcohol-related and 88 drug-related citations issued.
7. The projects also issued 67 sworn reports to motorists under the age of 21 with a positive BAC level under .08.
8. This report provides a trend analysis for MAP projects with multiple years of funding conducted between 2001 and 2003. Projects with only one year of funding were excluded from this analysis. A detailed analysis of the projects with multiple years of funding appears on Page 17 entitled "Trend Analysis of Selected MAP Projects (2001-2003)."

It should be noted that no specific occupant protection objectives were set for the MAP program since occupant protection violations are a secondary emphasis for the MAP projects. A total of 847 safety belt and child restraint citations/written warnings were issued during all seven campaigns.

# Table1

## FY03 MAP CAMPAIGN PROJECT DATA SUMMARY TABLE

### Totals

#### MAP "Overtime" Enforcement

Type of Citation	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Campaign #6	Campaign #7	Total
Speeding	237	220	194	229	253	188	192	1513
Other Moving Viol.	353	297	308	275	332	366	249	2180
DUI	76	58	70	55	68	86	89	502
Alcohol Related	78	51	76	56	85	89	91	526
Safety Belt	107	100	81	82	112	154	141	777
Child Restraint	11	5	11	8	9	16	10	70
Drugs	14	17	20	12	11	7	7	88
Weapons	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	5
Stolen Vehicles	1	0	2	0	1	2	0	6
Outstand Warrants	30	24	31	21	35	39	37	217
Suspended License	53	40	41	32	38	52	47	303
Sworn Reports	17	12	5	8	12	7	6	67
Safety Belt W/Warn.	23	43	20	8	40	27	34	195
Child Rest. W/Warn	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
Vehicles Stopped	903	861	739	762	966	816	1041	6088
Vehicle Contact Rate	47.2	47.9	56.1	52.2	46.3	57.5	47.9	50.4
Average B.A.C.'s								0.00
Total DUI Procs Hrs	123.68	101.35	113.24	96.19	112.97	137.8	158.62	730.88
Map Totals	1001	868	861	787	0	1035	903	5455

#### Regular Non-Overtime Patrol

Type of Citation	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Campaign #6	Campaign #7	Total
Speeding	1692	1416	1088	1250	1006	1020	1146	8618
Other Moving Viol.	1531	1280	1169	1500	1289	1096	1445	9310
DUI	99	103	93	88	86	74	114	657
Alcohol Related	71	75	53	86	66	87	130	568
Safety Belt	340	308	182	238	332	198	397	1995
Child Restraint	23	33	13	27	27	20	23	166
Safety Belt W/Warn.	28	42	20	12	51	10	27	190
Child Rest. W/Warn.	1	3	0	8	2	0	0	14
Regular Enf. Total	3785	3260	2618	3209		2505	3282	18659

#### MAP SUMMARY DATA

	Campaign #1	Campaign #2	Campaign #3	Campaign #4	Campaign #5	Campaign #6	Campaign #7	Total
Total Patrol Hours	710.8	688.03	690.8	663.37	745.37	781.65	831.79	5111.81
Total P.I. & E.'s	104	78	93	78	74	73	85	585

Average Campaign Patrol Hours	730.3	hours
Motorist Contact Rate (citations/written warnings)	56.2	min
Occupant Protection Violation Percentage	19.2	%
Speed Violation Percentage	27.7	%
DUI Rate	10.2	hours
Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate	4.3	hours

## Evaluation of the Mini-grant Alcohol Program (MAP)

In Illinois, during 2002 1,420 persons were killed in fatal crashes (Fatal Analysis Reporting System 2001). In 2002, approximately 127,719 persons were injured in crashes (Statewide Summary of Motor Vehicle Crash Statistics, 2002). The cost per death in Illinois for 2002 was \$1,090,000 and the cost per nonfatal disabling injury was \$52,700 (National Safety Council, Illinois 2001). Based on Fatal Analysis Reporting System (FARS) data, 533 (37.5 percent) of fatalities occurred in alcohol related crashes.

Many lives could be saved by changing public attitudes regarding risk taking behaviors such as impaired driving, speeding, and the non-use of safety belts and child safety seats. It has been shown that visible enforcement programs focusing on these violations offer the greatest potential for changing these behaviors. To change public attitudes regarding these behaviors, the Division of Traffic Safety (DTS) developed the MAP program (Mini-grant Alcohol enforcement Program). The MAP program provides overtime enforcement officers to enforce impaired driving and occupant protection violations during seven specified enforcement periods throughout the state. These enforcement periods are scheduled around holidays when the highways are the busiest. All agencies participating in the program conduct enforcement within the same two-week period (see **Appendix A**) to ensure high visibility of enforcement statewide.

The Specific Goals of the MAP Program are:

1. To reduce the number of fatal and alcohol-related traffic crashes.
2. To increase enforcement of impaired driving laws. (Secondary emphasis to speed and occupant restraint violations).

In FY03 the Division of Traffic Safety's Local Projects Section funded 21 MAP projects throughout the state. Funding for the MAP program, which is administered by DTS, is provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). Although a total of \$318,018.00 was obligated to fund the 21 MAP projects, actual program cost for FY03 was \$262,735.13. The average cost of one hour of patrol within a MAP project was \$63.18 (\$262,735.13 divided by 5,081,81 patrol hours), while the average cost of a citation/written warnings was \$48.16 (\$262,735.13 divided by 5,455 citations/written warnings) during FY03.

The evaluations of the MAP projects were based on the enforcement data submitted to the Division by the 21 local agencies. A graphic distribution of 21 MAP projects is displayed in Illinois map (see **Appendix B**).

**General objectives of the MAP projects:**

X number of patrol hours per enforcement campaign.

A minimum of one (1) motorist contact (written warnings and citations) for every 60 minutes of patrol.

A minimum of one DUI arrest for every ten (10) hours of patrol.

An alcohol-related contact of one for every six (6) hours of patrol.

A DUI processing rate of no more than two (2) hours.

The above objectives vary from location to location. The number of patrol hours and contact rates are determined by the population in that location, the higher the population size in that location, the higher the hours of patrol for that location.

This procedure has been determined using historical data available at the Division.

**Table A** depicts selected MAP grant categories based on population size and their specific objectives.



**Table A: Selected Objectives by Selected Population Categories.**

<b>Categories based on population (1)</b>	<b>Patrol hours (2)</b>	<b>Contact rate (3)</b>	<b>DUI Rate (4)</b>	<b>Alcohol-Related rate (5)</b>	<b>DUI processing (6)</b>
<b>2501-10,000</b>	24-30 per campaign (210 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol	A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less
<b>10,001-25,000</b>	36-42 per campaign (294 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol	A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less
<b>25,001-50,000</b>	40-46 per campaign (322 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol	A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less
<b>Over 50,000</b>	48-54 per campaign (378 annually)	One (1) contact for every 60 patrol minutes	One (1) DUI for every 10 hours of patrol	One (1) alc. Related citation every 6 hours patrol	A DUI processing rate of 2 hours or less

Footnote:

Column 1: Selected population categories

Column 2: Total number of hours assigned to each population category

Column 3: The number of traffic stops every 60 minutes of patrol.

Column 4: The assigned of DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

Column 5: The assigned number of alcohol-related citations for every six hours of patrol

Column 6: The number of hours to process a DUI.

## **Category 1: Population 2,501-10,000**

### **Participating Police Departments (7)**

- |                             |                                |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1) Bethalto Police Dept     | 2) Monmouth Police Dept.       |
| 3) Caseyville Police Dept.  | 4) New Athens Police Dept.     |
| 5) Creve Couer Police Dept. | 6) Olympia Fields Police Dept. |
| 7) Lebanon Police Dept.     |                                |

**Objective 1:** Conduct 24-30 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (168-210 hours annually).

#### **Accomplishments:**

Seven of seven projects met this objective. The category had a range of 17.8 hours of patrol per campaign in Bethalto to 32.7 hours of patrol per campaign in Caseyville.

**Objective 2:** Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

Five departments met this objective. They were Bethalto, Caseyville, Centreville, Lebanon and Monmouth. The category as a whole had a range of one motorist contact for every 26.7 minutes of patrol to one motorist contact for every 120.3 minutes of patrol.

**Objective 3:** Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

Four of the seven departments met this objective. The category had a range of one DUI citation for every 6.9 hours of patrol for the Lebanon Police Department to one DUI citation for every 14.8 hours of patrol for the New Athens Police Department.

**Objective 4:** Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

All seven departments met this objective. The category had a range of one alcohol-related citation every 1.9 hours of patrol to one alcohol-related citation every 5.1 hours of patrol.

**Objective 5:** Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

**Accomplishments:**

Six of seven departments met this objective. The category had a range of a DUI processing time of 0.3 of an hour to 2.3 hours to process a DUI.

**Category Results:**

Lebanon had the best DUI arrest rate in this category writing a DUI citation for every 6.9 hours of patrol. In this category there were 492 speeding, 125 DUI, 174 alcohol related, 258 seat belt and 21 child restraint citations issued.

**Table 2** provides data and information pertaining to **Category 1** projects.

**Table 2**  
**Category 1: Population 2,501 - 10,000**

	1	1	2	3		4	5		6	7		8	9		10	11	
	CRITERIA: 210 Hrs/Yr Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 24-30 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 45-60 Patrol Minutes		DUI Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest for Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours		Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related ContactPer Every 6 Patrol Hours		DUI Processing Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours	
				Criteria Met?			Criteria	Met?		Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?			Yes	No
				Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No
Bethalto	51.0	4	12.8		X	53.7	X		17.0		X	2.2	X		2.3		X
Caseyville	163.5	5	32.7	X		35.2	X		7.1	X		3.7	X		1.8	X	
Centreville	140.0	5	28.0	X		55.3	X		7.4	X		4.1	X		1.8	X	
Creve Couer	195.5	7	27.9	X		70.7		X	11.5		X	5.1	X		0.8	X	
Lebanon	210.0	7	30.0	X		31.2	X		8.1	X		4.2	X		0.3	X	
Monmouth	210.0	7	30.0	X		32.2	X		8.8	X		1.9	X		2.0	X	
New Athens	192.5	6	32.1	X		120.3		X	14.8		X	3.8	X		1.7	X	
Olympia Fields	50.0	2	25.0	X		46.9			50.0		X	50.0		X	1.5	X	

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory

Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) \* 60

Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports) )

Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

## **Category 2: Population 10,001-25,000**

### **Participating Police Departments (4)**

- 1) Bradley Police Department
- 2) Fairview Heights Police Department
- 3) McHenry Police Department
- 4) O'Fallon Police Department
- 5) Pike County Police Department
- 6) SIU Police Department
- 7) Western Illinois University Police Department
- 8) Wood Dale Police Department

**Objective 1:** Conduct 36-42 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (252-294 hours annually).

#### **Accomplishments:**

Seven of the eight departments met this objective. The other department marginally met this objective. The category had a range of 35.7 hours of patrol per campaign to a 47.1 hours of patrol per campaign.

**Objective 2:** Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

Two of the eight departments met this objective. McHenry and Western Illinois University Police Departments met the objective with contact rate of one contact for every 56.2 and 38.3 minutes of patrol respectively. The category had a range of one contact every 38.3 minutes of patrol to one contact every 205.3 minutes of patrol.

**Objective 3:** Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

One out of the eight departments met this objective (Western Illinois University Police Department). The Southern Illinois University and Wood Dale Police Departments marginally met this objective with a DUI citation for every 10.2 and 10.4 patrol hours respectively. The category had a range of one DUI citation for every 7.6 hours of patrol to one DUI citation for every 38.2 hours of patrol.

**Objective 4:** Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

Five of the eight departments met this objective. The category had a range of one alcohol-related citation for every 3.0 hours of patrol to one alcohol-related citation for every 13.5 hours of patrol.

**Objective 5:** Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

**Accomplishments:**

Eight of the departments met this objective. The category had a range of processing a DUI in 0.4 hours to processing a DUI in 2.0 hours.

**Category Results:**

Western Illinois University Police Department met all five objectives. The eight departments in this category wrote 325 speeding, 171 DUI, 144 alcohol related, 178 seat belt and 12 child restraint citations.

**Table 3** provides data and information pertaining to **Category 2** projects.

**Table 3**  
**Category 2: Population 10,001-25,000**

	1	1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11				
	CRITERIA: 294 Hrs/Year Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 36-42 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign		Motorist Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 45-60 Patrol Minutes	DUI Rate  (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest For Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours	Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related ContactPer Every 6 Patrol Hours	DUI Processing Rate  (In Hours)	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours				
	Criteria Met?				Criteria Met?				Criteria Met?				Criteria Met?				
	Yes			No	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes	No	Yes	No	
Bradley	253.0	7	36.1	X		111.6		X	12.0		X	5.9	X	1.6	X		
Fairview Heighhts	229.3	6	38.2	X		205.3		X	38.2		X	13.5		X	2.0	X	
McHenry	282.7	6	47.1	X		56.2	X		12.9		X	5.7	X		0.6	X	
O'Fallon	310.5	7	44.4	X		83.2		X	12.4		X	6.9		X	1.7	X	
Pike County	269.0	7	38.4	X		129.1		X	22.4		X	7.9		X	1.4	X	
SIU	214.0	6	35.7		X	60.3		X	10.2		X	5.9	X		1.6	X	
WIU	281.3	7	40.2	X		38.3	X		7.6	X		3.0	X		1.9	X	
Wood Dale	280.0	7	40.0	X		74.0		X	10.4		X	4.4	X		0.4	X	

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory

Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) \* 60

Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports) )

Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

### **Category 3: Population 25,001-50,000**

#### **Participating Police Departments (4)**

- 1) Alton Police Dept.
- 2) Chicago Heights Police Dept.
- 3) Moline Police Dept.
- 4) Rock Island Police Dept.

**Objective 1:** Conduct 40-46 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (280-322 hours annually).

#### **Accomplishments:**

All four departments met this objective. The category had a range of 46.5 hours of patrol per campaign to 55.7 hours of patrol per campaign.

**Objective 2:** Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

Chicago Heights was the only police department to meet this objective. The category had a range of one contact for every 46.3 minutes of patrol to one contact for every 85.3 minutes of patrol.

**Objective 3:** Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

Two departments met this objective (Rock Island and Chicago Heights Police Departments). The category had a range of one DUI for every 4.4 hours of patrol to one DUI for every 21.7 hours of patrol.

**Objective 4:** Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

#### **Accomplishments:**

Three of the four departments met this objective. Alton did not meet the objective. They issued one alcohol-related citation for every 9.3 patrol hours. The category had a range of one alcohol-related citation for every 2.1 hours of patrol to one alcohol-related citation every 9.3 hours of patrol.

**Objective 5:** Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

#### **Accomplishments:**

All four departments met the objective of processing DUIs in less than 2 hours. The category had a range of 1.4 hours to 1.7 hours to process a DUI.



**Category Results:**

Overall, the four departments in this category wrote 170 speeding, 161 DUI, 163 alcohol related, 147 seat belt and 7 child restraint citations. The Chicago Heights Police Department met all five objectives in their respective projects.

**Table 4** provides data and information pertaining to **Category 3** projects.

**Table 4**  
**Category 3: Population 25,001 - 50,000**

	1	1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11			
	CRITERIA: 322 Hrs/Year	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 40-46 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign	Motorist  Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 60 Patrol Minutes	DUI Rate  (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest For Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours	Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related ContactPer Every 6 Patrol Hours	DUI Processing Rate	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours				
	Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date			Criteria Met?		Criteria Yes		Met? No	Criteria Met?	Rate (In Hours)	Criteria Met?	Criteria Met?				
	Yes			No		Yes		No	Yes	No	Yes	No				
	(In Hours)			(In Hours)		(In Hours)		(In Hours)	(In Hours)	(In Hours)	(In Hours)	(In Hours)				
	Alton	390	7	55.7	X		85.3		X	18.6		X	9.3		X	
Chicago Heights	343	7	49.0	X		46.3	X		6.9	X		2.1	X		1.4	X
Moline	325	7	46.5	X		67.3		X	21.7		X	5.9	X		1.6	X
Rock Island	332	7	47.5	X		62.1		X	4.4	X		3.5	X		1.5	X

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory

Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours /

Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) \* 60

Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports) )

Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

## **Category 4: Population over 50,000**

### **Participating Police Departments (1)**

#### **1) Winnebago County Sheriff's Department**

**Objective 1:** Conduct 48-54 patrol hours per enforcement campaign (336-378 hours annually).

**Accomplishments:**

The Winnebago County Sheriffs department met this objective. They conducted 409 hours of patrol for an average of 58.4 per campaign.

**Objective 2:** Have a motorist contact rate of one for every 60 minutes of patrol.

**Accomplishments:**

Winnebago County easily met this objective. The motorist contact rate was one for every 18.1 minutes of patrol.

**Objective 3:** Write one DUI citation for every ten hours of patrol.

**Accomplishments:**

The Winnebago County Sheriffs Department wrote a DUI every 9.3 hours of patrol. This allowed them to meet this objective.

**Objective 4:** Write one alcohol-related citation for every six hours of patrol.

**Accomplishments:**

This objective was met by the Winnebago Sheriffs Department. They wrote one alcohol-related citation every 4.5 hours of patrol.

**Objective 5:** Have a DUI processing time of no more than two hours.

**Accomplishments:**

The Winnebago County Sheriffs Department also met this objective. Their DUI processing rate was exactly 2.0 per DUI

### **Category Results:**

The Winnebago County Sheriffs Department met every objective. They wrote 573 speeding, 44 DUI, 45 alcohol related, 190 seatbelt and 30 child restraint citations.

**Table 5** provides data and information pertaining to **Category 4** projects.

**Table 5**  
**Category 4: Population Over 50,000**

	1	1	2	3		4	5		6	7		8	9		10	11	
	CRITERIA: 378 Hrs/Yr.	Number of Campaigns Entered	Average Campaign Patrol Hours	CRITERIA: 48-54 Patrol Hrs Per Campaign		Motorist  Contact Rate (In Minutes)	CRITERIA: 1 Contact for Each 45-60 Patrol Minutes		DUI  Rate  (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 DUI Arrest For Every 10 Actual Patrol Hours		Alcohol/ Drug- Related Contact Rate (In Hours)	CRITERIA: 1 Alcohol/Drug- Related ContactPer Every 6 Patrol Hours		DUI Processing Rate  (In Hours)	CRITERIA: DUI Processing Rate No More Than 2 Hours	
	Total Campaign Patrol Hours To Date			Criteria Met?			Criteria Met?	Criteria Met?		Criteria Met?	Criteria Met?						
	Yes			No	Yes		No	Yes		No	Yes		No				
	Yes			No	Yes		No	Yes		No	Yes		No				
Winnebago Cty.	409	7	58.4	X		18.10	X		9.3	X		4.5	X		2.0	X	

Columns 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are self explanatory

Column 2 = Average Campaign Patrol Hours (# Patrol Hours / # Campaigns to Date)

Column 4 = Motorist Contact Rate = (Total Campaign Hours / # Citations & Written Warnings) \* 60

Column 6 = DUI Rate = (Total Number Patrol Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

Column 8 = Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate = (Total Number of Campaign Hours/(# DUI Citations + # Alcohol-Related Citations + # Drug Citations + # Sworn Reports) )

Column 10 = DUI Processing Rate = (Total Number of DUI Processing Hours / Total Number of DUI Citations)

## **TREND ANALYSIS of SELECTED MAP PROJECTS (2001-2003)**

**Table 6** provides a trend analysis for MAP projects with multiple years of funding conducted from 2001 to 2003. MAP projects with only one year of funding were excluded from this analysis.

Column 1 shows the MAP projects by the selected population categories (2,501 to 10,000; 10,001 to 25,000; 25,001 to 50,000; and 50,001 and above). Column 2 shows the years of project data; column 3 depicts the year the project started; and column 4 includes the total campaigns conducted during this time.

Columns 5 through 10 show the objectives of each project. Under each of these column headings are the accomplishments for each project in the first year of funding, accomplishments in the last year of funding, and the percent/percentage point change from the first year of funding. Column 5 shows the average hours conducted during each campaign. Column 6 shows the motorist contact rate objective, which required projects to issue one citation/written warning for every 60 minutes of patrol. Column 7 shows the DUI arrest rate objective (one DUI arrest for every 10 hours of patrol). Column 8 shows the alcohol/drug-related contact rate objective (one alcohol or drug-related contact for every six patrol hours). Column 9 shows the percentage of occupant restraint violations issued. Projects were required to issue 30 percent of all citations/written warnings for occupant restraint violations. Column 10 shows the percentage of citations issued for speeding violations. Projects were required to issue less than 50 percent of all citations/written warnings for speeding violations.

Each population category was further divided into three groups: 1) projects with two years of funding that started in 2001, 2) projects with two years of funding that started in 2002, and 3) projects with three years of funding that started in 2001.

### **2,501 TO 10,000 POPULATION CATEGORY**

There were seven projects with populations between 2,501 to 10,000 in this category; three of these projects started in 2001 and had two years of project data; three projects started in 2002 and had two years of project data; and one project started in 2001 and had three years of project data. Each of these projects conducted the maximum of seven campaigns per year with the exception of Bethalto which averaged just under six campaigns per year.

#### **Average Campaign Patrol Hours**

The campaign hours conducted by these seven projects in the first year of funding resulted in an average of 29.9 patrol hours per campaign. The hours conducted during the final year of funding dropped to 24.2 per campaign. During the first year of funding, the average campaign hours conducted ranged from

28.3 patrol hours per campaign (Mendota and Bethalto) to 34.5 patrol hours per campaign (Centreville). During the final year of funding, only two projects (Collinsville and Creve Coeur) increased their patrol hours, while the other five projects (Mendota, Riverside, Spring Grove, Monmouth, and Bethalto) decreased their patrol hours.

#### Motorist Contact Rate

A motorist contact rate of one citation/written warning was issued for every 58.3 minutes of patrol in the first year of funding. During the final year of funding, the motorist contact rate slightly increased to one citation/written warning issued for every 59.4 minutes of patrol.

There were four projects (Mendota, Riverside, Centreville, and Monmouth) which maintained a high motorist contact rate during project funding. Of these projects, Mendota, Riverside, and Monmouth improved their contact rates from the first year of funding to the final year of funding. Although Centreville met this objective during the first year of funding, it failed to improve the contact rate during the final year of funding.

The Bethalto project failed to meet the required motorist contact rate in the first year of funding by averaging one citation/written warning every 73.5 minutes of patrol, but this project met the objective in the final year of funding by issuing one citation/written warning for every 53.7 minutes of patrol.

Two projects (Spring Grove and Centreville) failed to meet the motorist contact rate objective. The contact rates for both of these projects declined during the second year of funding.

#### DUI Arrest Rate

During the first year of funding, an average of one DUI arrest was made every 12.4 hours of patrol. The average DUI arrest rate did not change during the final year of funding.

The projects in Riverside and Centreville issued more than one DUI arrest for every 10 hours of patrol. During the final year of funding, these projects issued more than one DUI arrest for every 7.6 patrol hours.

The projects in Spring Grove and Creve Coeur met this objective in the first year of funding, but failed to meet it during the final year of funding.

The Monmouth project did not meet the objective in the first year of funding by averaging one DUI for every 11 patrol hours, but during the final year of funding, the project met the objective by averaging one DUI arrest for every 8.8 patrol hours.

Two projects (Bethalto and Mendota) failed to meet DUI arrest rate objective. During the final year of funding, the DUI arrest rates declined for both of these projects.

#### Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate

The alcohol/drug-related contact rate for these projects improved from one contact made for every 5.4 hours during the first year of funding to one contact made for every 4.0 hours during the final year of funding.

Four projects (Riverside, Creve Coeur, Monmouth, and Bethalto) maintained high alcohol/drug-related contact rates. During the first year of funding, the contact rates for these projects ranged from one contact for every 6.2 patrol hours (Riverside) to one contact for every 3.3 patrol hours (Monmouth). During the final year of funding, the contact rates ranged from one contact for every 5.1 patrol hours (Creve Coeur) to one contact for every 1.9 patrol hours (Monmouth).

Spring Grove met this objective in the first year by averaging one alcohol/drug-related contact for every 5.3 patrol hours, but failed to meet the objective in the final year of funding by averaging one contact for every 6.8 patrol hours.

Two projects (Mendota and Centreville) failed to meet this objective in the first year of funding, but met the objective in the final year of funding.

#### Occupant Violation Percentage

The percentage of citations/written warnings issued for occupant restraint violations in the first year of funding was 17.9. This decreased by 7.6 percentage points in the final year of funding (10.3 percent). All of the projects, except Bethalto, failed to issue more than 30 percent of all of their citations/written warnings for occupant restraint violations. It should be noted that Bethalto only met this objective in the first year of funding (49 percent), but failed to meet the required objective in the final year of funding (8.8 percent).

#### Speeding Violations Percentage

Speeding violations accounted for 25.9 percent of all citation/written warnings issued in the first year of funding. This decreased by 2.3 percentage points in the final year of funding to 23.7 percent. All of the projects issued under 50 percent of all of their citations/written warnings for speeding violations, except Bartonville. The percent of speed violations among those projects which met this objective (under 50 percent) ranged from 10.1 percent (Lawrenceville) to 38.3 (Putnam County).

## **10,001 TO 25,000 POPULATION CATEGORY**

Of the four projects in this category, one started in 2002 and had two years of data, while three started in 2001 and had three years of data. Wood Dale and O'Fallon conducted the maximum number of campaigns during project funding while McHenry and the WIU Campus conducted 20 out of the 21 required campaigns.

### **Average Campaign Patrol Hours**

An average of 38.8 patrol hours was conducted per campaign during the first year of funding. The average patrol hours increased in the final year of funding to 42.9 per campaign.

During the first year of funding, the projects' patrol hours ranged from 36.8 per campaign (McHenry) to 40.4 per campaign (WIU Campus). During the final year of funding, the average patrol hours per campaign ranged from 40.0 (Wood Dale) to 47.1 (McHenry).

### **Motorist Contact Rate**

During the first year of funding, an average of one citation/written warning was issued for every 74.7 minutes of patrol and improved to one issued for every 62.9 minutes of patrol in the final year of funding (a decrease of 15.7 percent).

None of the projects met this objective in the first year of funding. The contact rates ranged from one citation/written warning issued for every 65.7 minutes of patrol (McHenry) to one issued for every 82.5 minutes of patrol (O'Fallon).

During the final year of funding, two of the projects (McHenry and WIU Campus) met this objective by issuing one citation/written warning for every 56.2 minutes and 38.3 minutes of patrol respectively. The projects in Wood Dale and O'Fallon failed to meet the objective during the final year of funding.

### **DUI Arrest Rate**

The DUI arrest rate improved from an average of one DUI arrest for every 12 patrol hours in the first year of funding to one DUI arrest for every 10.8 patrol hours in the final year.

The WIU campus was the only project to maintain a high DUI arrest rate. This project averaged one DUI arrest for every 7.6 patrol hours in the first year of funding to one for every 7.9 patrol hours in the final year of funding. The DUI arrest rate among the three projects (Wood Dale, O'Fallon, and McHenry) which failed to meet this objective ranged from one DU larrest for every 10.4 patrol hours (Wood Dale) to one for every 17.2 patrol hours (McHenry).



### Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate

During the first year of funding, an average of one alcohol-related contact was made for every 4.5 patrol hours. There was a slight change from the first year of funding with one alcohol-related contact made for every 5.0 patrol hours.

All of the projects met the alcohol/drug-related contact rate ranging from one contact made for every 3.0 patrol hours (WIU campus) to one made for every 6.3 patrol hours (McHenry).

### Occupant Protection Violation Percentage

In the first year of funding, more than 15 percent of all citations/written warnings were for occupant restraint violations. During the final year of funding, this increased to 21 percent (a 5.7 percentage point increase).

All of the projects, except the WIU campus, failed to meet this objective. The WIU campus met this objective in the final year of funding by issuing 30.6 percent of all citations/written warnings for occupant restraint violations.

### Speeding Violations Percentage

Speeding violations accounted for 18.6 percent of all citations/written warnings in the first year of funding, but slightly decreased to 16.8 percent in the final year of funding (a 1.8 percentage point decrease). All of the projects kept their speeding citations under 50 percent ranging from 6.3 percent (O'Fallon) to 29.0 percent (Wood Dale).

## **25,001 TO 50,000 POPULATION CATEGORY**

There were four projects in this category. Two projects started in 2001 and conducted two years of data; one started in 2002 and conducted two years of data; and one project started in 2001 and had three years of data.

### Average Campaign Patrol Hours

Overall, an average of 45.0 patrol hours was conducted per campaign during the first year of funding. During the final year of funding, the average patrol hours increased slightly to 46.1 per campaign resulting in a percentage point increase of 2.5. In the first year of funding, the patrol hours ranged from 39.9 hours per campaign for Livingston County to 48.2 hours per campaign for Chicago Heights. During the final year of funding, the patrol hours slightly increased and ranged from 41.4 hours per campaign for Livingston County to a high of 49.0 hours per campaign for Chicago Heights.

### Motorist Contact Rate

These projects issued one citation/written warning for every 55.4 minutes of patrol in the first year of funding. This contact rate dropped slightly to one citation/written warning made for every 58.2 minutes of patrol in the final year of funding.

Chicago Heights was the only project to maintain a high contact rate during project funding by issuing more than one citation/written warning for every 48 minutes of patrol.

Livingston County failed to meet the objective in the first year of funding by issuing one citation/written warning for every 64.9 minutes of patrol. This project met the objective in the final year of funding by issuing one citation/written warning for every 57.0 minutes of patrol.

Moline and Rock Island met the objective in the first year of funding by issuing one citation/written warning for every 55.8 and 53.2 minutes of patrol respectively. Neither of these projects met this objective in the final year of funding by issuing one citation/written warning for every 67.3 and 62.1 minutes of patrol respectively.

### DUI Arrest Rate

During the first year of funding, an average of one DUI arrest was made for every 10.4 patrol hours. In the final year of funding, this dropped to one DUI arrest made for every 12.4 hours of patrol.

Rock Island and Chicago Heights maintained high DUI arrest rates during project funding. Rock Island issued more than one DUI arrest for every 5.2 patrol hours, while Chicago Heights issued more than one DUI arrest for every 7.3 patrol hours.

The other two projects (Livingston County and Moline) failed to meet this objective. The DUI arrest rates for these two projects ranged from one DUI arrest made for every 13.6 patrol hours to one made for every 21.7 patrol hours.

### Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate

During the first year of funding, an average of one alcohol/drug-related contact was made for every 6.0 patrol hours. This improved to one alcohol/drug-related contact made for every 4.4 patrol hours.

Rock Island and Chicago Heights maintained high alcohol/drug-related contact rates during project funding. Rock Island maintained an alcohol/drug-related contact rate better than one for every 3.6 patrol hours, while Chicago Heights

maintained an alcohol/drug-related contact rate better than one for every 3.7 patrol hours.

During the first year of funding, Livingston County and Moline failed to meet this objective by averaging one alcohol/drug-related contact for every 8.7 and 7.8 patrol hours respectively. Both projects met the objective in the final year of funding. Livingston County averaged one contact for every 6.2 patrol hours, while Moline averaged one contact for every 5.9 patrol hours.

#### Occupant Protection Violation Percentage

In the first year of funding, occupant restraint violations accounted for 19.0 percent of all citation/written warnings issued. In the final year of funding, the percentage of occupant restraint citations/written warnings dropped to 14.4 percent (a decrease of 4.5 percentage points).

Among the four projects in this category (Livingston County, Moline, Rock Island, and Chicago Heights), Moline was the only project to meet this objective in the first year of funding (29.8 percent), but failed to meet this objective during the final year of funding (25.5 percent).

#### Speeding Violations Percentage

All of the projects issued less than 50.0 percent of all citations/written warnings for speeding violations. The percentage of speeding violations ranged from 4.7 in Rock Island to 44.6 in Livingston County. The percentage of speeding citations/written warnings decreased 23.4 in the first year of funding to 18.3 during the last year of funding (a decrease of 5.1 percentage points).

### **50,001 AND ABOVE POPULATION CATEGORY**

This category included three projects which started in 2001 with two years of data and one project which started in 2001 with three years of data.

#### Average Campaign Patrol Hours

An average of more than 53.7 hours was conducted per campaign for these projects. In the first year of funding, the average patrol hours ranged from 44.8 (Peoria) to 59.9 (Tazewell County). In the final year of funding, the patrol hours ranged from 49 (Peoria) to 58.4 (Winnebago County).

#### Motorist Contact Rate

In the first year of funding, one citation/written warning was issued for every 64.8 minutes of patrol. In the final year of funding, the contact rate dropped to one citation/written warning issued for every 76.4 minutes of patrol.

Peoria and Winnebago County were the only projects in this category to meet this objective. In the first year of funding, Peoria made one motorist contact for every 30 minutes of patrol, while Winnebago County made one motorist contact for every 26.8 minutes of patrol. In the final year of funding, Peoria's motorist contact rate dropped to one citation/written warning issued for every 52.1 minutes of patrol, while Winnebago County's motorist contact rate improved to one citation/written warning issued for every 18.1 minutes of patrol.

The other three projects (Tazewell County, Peoria County, and Schaumburg) failed to meet the motorist contact rate objective. The contact rates for these three projects ranged from one citation/written warning issued for every 63.2 minutes of patrol in Schaumburg to one issued for every 136.6 minutes of patrol in Peoria County.

### *DUI Arrest Rate*

During the first year of funding, these projects made one DUI arrest for every 13.4 patrol hours. In the final year of funding, the projects failed to improve this rate by making one DUI arrest for every 16.7 patrol hours.

The only project that met this objective was Peoria by making one DUI arrest for every 5 patrol hours in the first year of funding and one DUI arrest for every 5.4 patrol hours in the final year of funding.

Winnebago County did not meet this objective in the first year of funding (one DUI arrest made for every 13.4 patrol hours), but did meet it in the final year of funding by making one DUI arrest for every 9.8 patrol hours.

The other three projects (Tazewell County, Peoria County, and Schaumburg) failed to meet this objective. The DUI arrest rates for these three projects ranged from one made for every 10.3 patrol hours in Tazewell County to one made for every 30.7 patrol hours in Schaumburg.

### *Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate*

In the first year of funding, one alcohol/drug-related contact was made for every 7.6 patrol hours and in the final year of funding, one alcohol/drug-related contact was made for every 8.5 patrol hours.

Tazewell County and Peoria were the only projects which maintained high alcohol/drug-related contact rates. The alcohol/drug-related contact rates for these projects ranged from one contact made for every 4.1 patrol hours to one made for every 5.9 patrol hours.

Winnebago County failed to meet this objective during the first year of funding by averaging on alcohol/drug-related contact made for every 6.7 patrol hours, but met the objective during the final year of funding by averaging one alcohol/drug-related contact for every 4.5 patrol hours.

Peoria County and Schaumburg failed to meet this objective. The alcohol/drug-related contact rate for both of these projects ranged from one contact made for every 9.9 patrol hour to one contact made for every 14.7 patrol hours.

#### Occupant Violation Percentage

An average of 15.2 percent of all citations/written warnings was issued for occupant restraint violations in the first year of funding, but this decreased to 14.3 percent in the final year of funding (about one percentage point decrease).

None of the projects met this objective. The percentage of occupant restraint violations ranged from 5.6 (Peoria County) to 25.6 (Winnebago County).

#### Speeding Violations Percentage

During the first and last years of funding, speeding violations stayed about the same at 32.4 percent.

Four of the five projects (Tazewell County, Peoria County, Schaumburg, and Winnebago County) issued less than 50 percent of their citations/written warnings for speeding violations. The percentage for these four projects ranged from 20.5 for Tazewell County to 42.3 for Winnebago County. Peoria failed to meet this objective during the first year of funding (more than 60 percent), but managed to meet this objective during the final year by issuing less than 48 percent.

## Table 6: MAP PROJECT TREND ANALYSIS 2001 TO 2003

TOWN/CITY BY POPULATION CATEGORY  (1)	Years of Project Data  (2)	Project Year  (3)	Total # Campaigns Conducted  (4)	Avg. Campaign Hours			Motorist Contact Rate			DUI Arrest Rate			Alcohol/Drug-Related Contact Rate (8)			Occupant Violation Percentage (9)			Speed Violation Percentage (10)		
				(5)			(6)			(7)											
				1st Year	Last Year	% Change	1st Year	Last Year	% Change	1st Year	Last Year	% Change	1st Year	Last Year	% Change	1st Year	Last Year	% Point Change	1st Year	Last Year	% Point Change
<b><u>2,501 TO 10,000</u></b>																					
Mendota	2	2001	14	28.3	26.9	-4.9%	56.8	52.9	-6.9%	22.0	23.6	7.3%	6.4	5.0	-21.9%	22.5%	11.7%	-10.8%	30.1%	19.6%	-10.5%
Riverside	2	2001	14	30.8	22.8	-26.0%	60.4	42.4	-29.8%	9.8	7.6	-22.4%	6.2	3.2	-48.4%	3.3%	1.5%	-1.8%	37.9%	37.6%	-0.3%
Spring Grove	2	2001	14	31.3	25.1	-19.8%	82.0	108.6	32.4%	9.5	12.5	31.6%	5.3	6.8	28.3%	2.5%	1.0%	-1.5%	15.0%	13.4%	-1.6%
Centreville	2	2002	7	34.5	28.0	-18.8%	32.3	55.3	71.2%	9.9	7.4	-25.3%	6.9	4.1	-40.6%	2.3%	17.8%	15.5%	1.6%	12.5%	10.9%
Creve Coeur	2	2002	14	26.5	27.9	5.3%	65.5	70.7	7.9%	8.4	11.5	36.9%	4.3	5.1	18.6%	18.2%	9.0%	-9.2%	24.1%	36.7%	12.6%
Monmouth	2	2002	14	29.8	30.0	0.7%	37.3	32.2	-13.7%	11.0	8.8	-20.0%	3.3	1.9	-42.4%	26.6%	22.3%	-4.3%	28.7%	28.1%	-0.6%
Bethalto	3	2001	17	28.3	8.5	-70.0%	73.5	53.7	-26.9%	16.5	17.0	3.0%	5.4	2.2	-59.3%	49.6%	8.8%	-40.8%	14.2%	29.8%	15.6%
AVERAGE				29.9	24.2	-19.2%	58.3	59.4	2.0%	12.4	12.6	1.5%	5.4	4.0	-25.1%	17.9%	10.3%	-7.6%	21.7%	25.4%	3.7%
<b><u>10,001 TO 25,000</u></b>																					
Wood Dale	2	2002	14	40.3	40.0	-0.7%	79.1	74.0	-6.4%	10.4	10.4	0.0%	4.1	4.4	7.3%	10.7%	22.9%	12.2%	29.0%	28.2%	-0.8%
McHenry	3	2001	20	36.8	47.1	28.0%	65.7	56.2	-14.5%	17.2	12.9	-25.0%	6.3	5.7	-9.5%	8.5%	13.6%	5.1%	26.0%	18.5%	-7.5%
W.I.U. Campus	3	2001	20	40.4	40.2	-0.5%	71.4	38.3	-46.4%	7.9	7.6	-3.8%	3.5	3.0	-14.3%	22.3%	30.6%	8.3%	13.0%	8.8%	-4.2%
O'Fallon	3	2001	21	37.5	44.4	18.4%	82.5	83.2	0.8%	12.5	12.4	-0.8%	4.2	6.9	64.3%	19.9%	17.0%	-2.9%	6.3%	11.6%	5.3%
AVERAGE				38.8	42.9	10.8%	74.7	62.9	-15.7%	12.0	10.8	-9.8%	4.5	5.0	10.5%	15.4%	21.0%	5.7%	18.6%	16.8%	-1.8%
<b><u>25,001 TO 50,000</u></b>																					
Livingston County	2	2001	14	39.9	41.4	3.8%	64.9	57.0	-12.2%	15.5	15.2	-1.9%	8.7	6.2	-28.7%	27.5%	22.0%	-5.5%	44.6%	39.7%	-4.9%
Moline	2	2001/2003	14	44.7	46.5	4.0%	55.8	67.3	20.6%	13.6	21.7	59.6%	7.8	5.9	-24.4%	29.8%	25.5%	-4.3%	22.0%	14.5%	-7.5%
Rock Island	2	2002	14	47.1	47.5	0.8%	53.2	62.1	16.7%	5.2	4.4	-15.4%	3.6	3.5	-2.8%	8.1%	5.9%	-2.2%	12.9%	4.7%	-8.2%
Chicago Heights	3	2001	20	48.2	49.0	1.7%	47.6	46.3	-2.7%	7.3	6.9	-5.5%	3.7	2.1	-43.2%	10.4%	4.3%	-6.1%	14.1%	14.2%	0.1%
AVERAGE				45.0	46.1	2.5%	55.4	58.2	5.1%	10.4	12.1	15.9%	6.0	4.4	-25.6%	19.0%	14.4%	-4.5%	23.4%	18.3%	-5.1%
<b><u>50,001 AND ABOVE</u></b>																					
Tazewell County	2	2001	13	59.9	56.9	-5.0%	77.6	94.1	21.3%	10.3	14.8	43.7%	4.3	5.9	37.2%	15.5%	20.1%	4.6%	21.9%	20.5%	-1.4%
Peoria	2	2001	14	44.8	49.0	9.4%	30.0	52.1	73.7%	5.0	5.4	8.0%	4.1	4.9	19.5%	6.9%	10.4%	3.5%	61.0%	48.1%	-12.9%
Peoria County	2	2001	14	52.1	52.7	1.2%	126.4	136.6	8.1%	22.8	23.1	1.3%	13.0	12.7	-2.3%	6.9%	5.6%	-1.3%	30.6%	27.8%	-2.8%
Schaumburg	2	2001	14	52.5	52.6	0.2%	63.2	80.9	28.0%	15.3	30.7	100.7%	9.9	14.7	48.5%	20.9%	19.0%	-1.9%	21.8%	25.3%	3.5%
Winnebago County	3	2001	20	59.2	58.4	-1.4%	26.8	18.1	-32.5%	13.4	9.3	-30.6%	6.7	4.5	-32.8%	25.6%	16.2%	-9.4%	26.5%	42.3%	15.8%
AVERAGE				53.7	53.9	0.4%	64.8	76.4	17.8%	13.4	16.7	24.7%	7.6	8.5	12.4%	15.2%	14.3%	-0.9%	32.4%	32.8%	0.4%

## Appendix A

<b>MINI-GRANT ALCOHOL ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM</b> <b>FY 2003 Campaign Dates</b>		
#1	Nov. 10 – 16, 2002	PI&E
	Nov. 17 – Nov., 30, 2002	Enforcement
	Dec. 1 – Dec 7, 2002	PI&E
	Jan 10, 2003	Report Due
#2	<u>Dec. 8 – 14, 2002</u>	PI&E
	Dec. 15 – Dec 28, 2002	Enforcement
	Dec. 29, 2002 – Jan. 4, 2003	PI&E
	Feb. 10, 2003	Report Due
#3	Feb. 2 – Feb. 8, 2003	PI&E
	Feb. 9 - 22, 2003	Enforcement
	Feb. 23 – March 1, 2003	PI&E
	April 10, 2003	Report Due
#4	March 30 – April 5, 2003	PI&E
	April 6 – 19, 2003	Enforcement
	April 20 – April 26, 2003	PI&E
	June 10, 2003	Report Due
#5	May 11 – 17, 2003	PI&E
	May 18 – May 31, 2003	Enforcement
	June 1 – June 7, 2003	PI&E
	July 10, 2003	Report Due
#6	June 15 - 21, 2003	PI&E
	June 22 - July 5, 2003	Enforcement
	July 6 - 12, 2003	PI&E
	Aug. 10, 2003	Report Due
#7	Aug. 17 – 23, 2003	PI&E
	Aug. 24 – Sept. 6, 2003	Enforcement
	Sept. 7 – 13, 2003	PI&E
	October 10, 2003	Report Due

## Appendix B



⑧=The number of  
MAP projects in that county